

ROUTE 28 STATION -- SOUTH STUDY

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

Work Group Comments on Draft Plan Text

01-17-13
Coates E.S.

Draft Plan Text: http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft_plan_text_01_17_13.pdf

Work Group Comments

Initial Staff Response

LAND USE:

- **Planned Development Table:** Indicates that the proposed Comprehensive Plan would actually reduce the amount of retail within Land Unit A. (page 2)
 - Staff will correct this arithmetic error. The proposed Comp. Plan would allow for additional retail.
- **Affordable Housing:** Intensity higher than 1.0 FAR should provide a contribution greater than current County-wide policies. (page 3)
- **Sub-Unit A-5:** Suggestion that the specific recommendations for parks and schools should be addressed for a wider area than sub-unit A-5. (page6)

TRANSPORTATION:

- **Land Use/Transportation Balance Monitoring System:** Who will bear responsibility for monitoring land use/transp. balance? (page 7)
 - County staff will, but will also require assistance of applicants.
- **Road Network and Circulation (additional crossing of Centreville Road):** What is the source of the road transportation improvement of a new Centreville Road crossing at McNair Farms Drive? (page 8 & page 9 graphic) It is pointed out that this new road would cross FCPA wetlands.
 - Is it environmentally sensitive?
 - Will it need to address Arrowbrook owner's maintenance agreement?
- **New street typologies and VDOT standards:** Don't these typologies' standards conflict with current VDOT standards? Won't these VDOT standards need to be changed or an agreement reached to allow these more "urban" standards? (pages 9-10)
 - VDOT has an agreement with the County on Tysons "urban" streets
 - County is negotiating a county-wide agreement w/ VDOT for "urban" streets (including our study area).
- **Grid of Streets Map too rigid:** The grid of streets concept needs to be more flexible than the current lines on a map suggest. If circumstances change, the same lines remain. (page 9 graphic)

- Also, existing development will require flexibility on standards.
 - Staff acknowledges that we need to include additional text to provide for this flexibility, to support any map/graphic.
- **Rock Hill Road Bridge:** Should the Work Group address the bridge issue, and if so, how?
- **Bicycle Facilities doesn't address trails:** The text doesn't address off-street bicycle trails. (page 10)
 - This is addressed in the draft Bicycle Master Plan document.
- **Parking maximums:** Is there current County policy addressing parking maximums for TOD areas as raised under the Parking Management section? (page 11)
 - Parking reductions/maximums aren't addressed specifically in draft text.
 - Current Zoning Ordinance requires minimums; maybe we could remove such requirements for this TOD area.

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP:

- No comments

URBAN PARKS:

- No comments.

PUBLIC FACILITIES:

- **New Schools:** Would these schools be located in Land Unit A? (page 16)
- **Level of Detail for Public Facilities text:** How does the WG want the Plan text to address public facilities text, more detail or less?

URBAN DESIGN:

- **Policy Plan's existing Urban Design (UD) guidance:** Doesn't the Policy Plan include UD guidance?
 - No. Each Area Plan addresses UD individually. There is redundancy but staff plans to, at later point, look to address UD on a county-wide level. Another county-wide plan amendment.
- **UD universal applicability vs unique approaches:** Are all TODs similar enough to use County-wide UD guidance, or should our TOD address UD uniquely?
- **Streetscape design flexibility and even more flexibility:** Suggestion to remove the word "pre-existing" to increase flexibility even more. (page 19)
- **Centreville Road into a Boulevard:** How will we convert Centreville Road to a boulevard streetscape? (page 20)
 - Either remove the Boulevard concept, or specify that it's a public responsibility to implement.
 - Suggestion that Centreville Road is at the edge of the TOD area, so it seems less necessary to realizing the TOD environment. In Tysons, where the Plan also calls for a Boulevard concept, Routes 7 and 123 are directly in front of the Metro stations and therefore their transformation through the Boulevard concept is a requirement to realizing the TOD environment.

- **Bike Lanes in streetscape graphics and descriptive text:** Where are bike lanes addressed in the streetscape sections and text?
 - The streetscape sections only address building face to street curb. Facilities between street curbs, including bike lanes, are addressed in the transportation section.
- **Building Heights:** Suggestion for building heights to be addressed with more nuance than just relating to the Metro station, Route 28 and Toll Road. (pages 25-26)
- **Parking Design too focused on underground parking:** The bullet for underground parking seems too restrictive of other types of parking. (page 25)

DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER (OUTSIDE LAND UNIT A & B-1)

- We will focus on Land Unit A and B-1. Staff will provide some editorial-type changes to other parts of the Dulles Suburban Center text to ensure agreement between areawide and land unit-specific guidance.